PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY PCTTo: WRITTEN OPINION OF THE see form PCT/ISA/220 INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION see form PCT/ISA/220 See paragraph 2 below Priority date (day/month/year) International filing date (day/month/year) International application No. 04.07.2003 PCT/EP2004/006238 08.06.2004 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C22B19/04, C22B19/04, C22B5/10, C22B5/12, C22B5/16, C22B13/02 Applicant **UMICORE** This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. 1 Basis of the opinion Box No. Ⅱ Priority Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability ☐ Box No. III Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial Box No. V applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application **FURTHER ACTION** If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of malling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Authorized Officer Name and mailing address of the ISA:

Bjoerk, P

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8452



European Patent Office

Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d

D-80298 Munich

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/006238

_	Box No. I Basis of the opinion				
1.	With regard to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international applica he language in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.				
	This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international sear (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).				
With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:					
	a. type of material:				
	a sequence listing				
	□ table(s) related to the sequence listing				
	b format of material:				
	.: in written format				
	in computer readable form				
	c time of filing/furnishing:				
	contained in the international application as filed.				
	filed together with the international application in computer readable form.				
	urnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.	`			
	In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relationable that the information in the subsequent or additionable copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed appropriate, were furnished.	ting there ditional , as			
	Additional comments:				

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/006238

_	Box N	lo. II	Priority						
1.	☐ The following document has not been furnished:								
		copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).							
		translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43 bis.1 and 66.7(b)).							
	Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.								
2.	This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.								
3.	3. Additional observations, if necessary:								
			-						
			•	. ,					
	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement								
1.	Stater	nent							
	Novel	ty (N))	Yes:	Claims Claims	1-12			
	Invent	tive s	tep (IS)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-12			
	Indus	trial a	applicability (IA)	Yes:	Claims Claims	1-12			
2	Citatio	ons a	nd explanations						

see separate sheet

- 1. The application relates to a process for extracting metal values from Zn-, Fe- and Pb-bearing residues and involves (i) a direct reduction step producing a metallic Fe-bearing phase, (ii) an extraction of Zn and Pb from the thus obtained first fumes, (iii) an oxidising smelting step to produce an Fe-bearing slag and (iv) an extraction of metals from the thus obtained second fumes.
- 2. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1 = Heard R. et al, "Recycling of Zinc-Bearing Residues with the PRIMUS ® Process", Iron Steelmaker I and SM, Vol.30, Nr 4, April 2003, p.55-60 D2 = Esna-Ashari M and Kerney U, "Smelting Reactor for Recovering Zinc from Industrial Low Zinc Bearing Residues", Erzmetall 53 (2000), Nr 6, p. 373-384

D1 discloses the PRIMUS ® process whereby Zn-bearing residues are submitted to (i) direct reduction in a multiple hearth furnace (Fig.2) to produce a reduced Febearing phase and Zn- and Pb-bearing fumes, (ii) extraction of the Zn- and Pb-bearing fumes for valorisation of Zn and Pb (paragraph bridging pages 58 and 59), (iii) melting of the Fe-bearing phase in an electric furnace, thereby producing both metal melt for the pig iron production and a slag suitable for road or building construction (page 59, middle and right columns) and (iv) extraction of offgases from the melting furnace for collection and cleaning in the primary exhaust line (page 60, left column, 3rd bullet).

D2 discloses a process for extracting metal values from Zn-, Fe- and Pb-bearing residues with the following steps: (i) smelting in a reactor in order to obtain an FeO-bearing phase and Zn- and Pb-fumes, (ii) an extraction of the Zn- and Pb-fumes via a settler placed below the smelting reactor into a waste heat boiler for collection in a bag house, (iii) an oxidising smelting with the help of lances in the settler to produce an Fe-bearing slag and (iv) an additional dezincing and deleading from further fumes originating in step (iii) (see "1. Process description" on pages 374-375 and Fig.1).

3. The process of present claim 1 differs from the PRIMUS ® process of D1 through the step (iii) of an oxidising smelting step to produce an Fe-bearing slag. In D1, the reduced iron is intended for pig iron production and not for its recovery in a slag phase.

International application No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

PCT/EP2004/006238

The process also differs from that of D2 in that the step (i) is that of a direct reduction to produce metallic Fe-bearing phase. In D2 the smelting does not lead to a metallic Fe-bearing phase.

The subject matter of claim 1 and consequently of its dependent claims 2 to 12 therefore fulfills the requirement of novelty of Art.33(2) PCT.

4. The combination of the processes of D1 and D2 in order to obtain that of present claim 1 is not seen as obvious as these processes lead to different products.

Consequently, the subject matter of claims 1 to 12 is also seen to fulfill the requirement of inventive step of Art.33(3) PCT.